

### REMARKS

Claims 1-42 and 45-63 are currently pending in the application, with claims 1, 17, 18, 26, 42, 45, and 53 being independent. New claims 62-63 are presented for consideration by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration of this response in light of the amendments and comments contained herein, and earnestly seek timely allowance of the pending claims.

This amendment is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). In Applicant's RCE, Applicant requests entry of the Reply After Final filed December 6, 2006. In addition to new claim 61 presented in Applicant's Reply After Final. Applicant submits, in this Preliminary Amendment, new claims 62-63 for consideration by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added in these claims.

In Applicant's Reply After Final filed December 6, 2006, and in Applicant's Reply filed June 15, 2006, Applicant presented several arguments for consideration by the Examiner. Specifically, Applicant requested that

- 1) Examiner provide Applicant with the result of his meeting with the Quality Assurance Specialist regarding the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection;
- 2) Examiner consider the Information Disclosure Statement filed May 24, 2006;
- 3) Examiner comment on the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection in light of the fact that he admitted that the specification provides sufficient evidence to one skilled in the art regarding the objected terms;
- 4) Examiner respond to Applicant's argument that *Bates* fails to disclose at least "wherein the imaginary surface represents physical positions in a unique and continuous manner and represents a physical area which is larger than any single practicable useable surface";
- 5) Examiner properly identify the patent number that he is relying upon to reject the outstanding claims;
- 6) Examiner properly respond to Applicant's argument that *Bates* fails to teach that the window is larger than any single surface;

- 7) Examiner properly respond to Applicant's argument that neither *Bates* nor *Sekender*, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest "wherein the imaginary surface represents physical positions in a unique and continuous manner and represents a physical area which is larger than any single practicable useable surface";
- 8) Examiner properly respond to Applicant's argument that neither *Bates* nor *Sekender*, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest "wherein the two-dimensional coordinate reference represents physical positions in a unique and continuous manner and represents a physical area which is larger than any single practicable and useable surface"; and
- 9) Examiner properly respond to Applicant's argument that there is no motivation to properly modify the teachings of *Bates* with the teachings of *Sekender*.

However, the Examiner has only responded to items 3 and 4 set forth above. In addition, with regard to item 5, the Examiner admits that he has provided the improper patent number, but has failed to identify the proper patent number upon which he relies for his rejection. The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to MPEP §707.05(g) and the Applicant, again, respectfully requests the Examiner properly identify the correct patent number of the *Sekender* reference.

In addition, the Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to MPEP §707.07(f) which requires the Examiner properly respond to all material traversed by the Applicant.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner properly respond to all of Applicant's traversed material set forth above as argued on June 15, 2006, and December 6, 2006.

For all of the reasons of record, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are patentable over the art as cited and respectfully requests the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time-fees.

Dated: January 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants